

Library Research Service. (2001, July 1). Librarians, Teachers and Principals Agree: "Power Libraries" lead to higher student test scores. *Fast Facts*, 178. <<http://www.lrs.org/documents/fastfacts/178powerlibs.pdf>>.

Mayo, Diane. (1999). *Wired for the Future: Developing your library technology plan*. Chicago: American Library Association, Public Library Association.

McClure, Charles R. (1994, Spring). User-based data collection techniques and strategies for evaluating networked information services. *Library Trends*, 42 (2), 591-607.

McClure, Charles R., Babcock, Waldo C., Nelson, Karen A. Polly, Jean Armour, and Kankus, Stephen R. (1994, February 15). *The Project Gain Report: Connecting Rural Public Libraries to the Internet*. Liverpool, NY: NYSERNET. Cost: \$10 Available: NYSERNET, Inc., Publications Office, 200 Elwood Davis Road, Suite 103, Liverpool, NY 13088-6147. Phone: (315) 453-2912 E-mail: info@nysernet.org

McClure, Charles R. and Bertot, John Carlo. (1997, October). *Evaluation of the OnLine at PA Libraries project: Public access to the Internet through public libraries*. Harrisburg, PA: State Library of Pennsylvania. Available: WWW: <http://www.pde.psu.edu/library/eval.html>

McClure, Charles R. and Bertot, John Carlo. (1998, June). *Public Library Use in Pennsylvania: Identifying uses, benefits, and impacts*. Harrisburg, PA: State Library of Pennsylvania. Available: WWW: <http://www.pde.psu.edu/library/impact.html>

McClure, Charles R., and Bertot, John Carlo. (2000a). *Public Library Internet Services: Impacts on the Digital Divide, Stage I final report*. Washington, DC: American Library Association, Office of Information Technology and Policy. <http://www.ala.org/oitp/telecom/telecom_pub.html>

McClure, Charles R., and Bertot, John Carlo. (2000b). *Public Library Internet Services: Impacts on the Digital Divide, Stage II final report*. Washington, DC: American Library Association, Office of Information Technology and Policy.

McClure, Charles R., Bertot, John Carlo and Rubin, Jeffrey H. (1998, December 8). *InFoPeople Surveys and Quarterly Statistics: Preliminary findings*. Submitted to Peninsula Library System, San Mateo, CA. Available: WWW: <http://www.infopeople.org/Proj/eval/index.html>

MGT of America Inc. (2001, September 26). Division of Library and Information Services. *LSTA Evaluation Final Report*. Tallahassee, FL: MGT of America Inc.

Miles, Matthew B. & Huberman, A. Michael. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Molz, Redmond Kathleen. (1984). *National Planning for Library Service: 1935-1975*. Chicago: American Library Association.

- Molz, Redmond Kathleen. (1990). *Federal Roles in Support of Public Library Services: An Overview*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Morgan, David L. (1988). *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2001, November 14). E.D. TAB: State Library Agencies: Fiscal Year 2000. Washington, DC: NCES. Available: <<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002302>>
- National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2000, September 7). E.D. TAB: State Library Agencies, Fiscal Year 1999. Washington, DC: NCES. Available: <<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2000374>>
- National Center for Small Communities. Community and Economic Development. (2001). Getting online: A guide to the Internet for small town leaders. <http://www.natat.org/ncsc/Pubs/Getting%20Online/getting_online.htm>
- Nelson, Sandra; Altman, Ellen & Mayo, Diane. (1999). *Managing for Results: Effective resource allocation for public libraries*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Patton, Michael Quinn. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Puma, Michael J.; Chaplin, Duncan D. & Pape, Andreas D. (2000, September). *E-Rate and the Digital Divide: A Preliminary Analysis from the Integrated Studies of Educational Technology*. Washington DC: Urban Institute for the U.S. Department of Education. Available from ERIC: ED445671 <<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/eval/elem.html#technology>>.
- Raber, Douglas. (1995, May/June). Ideological opposition to federal library legislation: The case of the Library Services Act of 1956. *Public Libraries* 34, 162-169.
- Rossi, P.H. & Freeman, H. (1993). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ryan, Joe & McClure, Charles R. (1997, August 12). *Citizen Access to Government and Other Information*. An onsite evaluation of a U.S. Department of Education HEA II-B R039D50010-95A funded project October 1, 1995 to September 30, 1997 for the Portland Area Library System (PORTALS), Portland State University. For report see ERIC document: ED 410-970.
- Schneider, Karen G. (2002, January). Internet Librarian: E-rate: The agony and the ecstasy. *American Libraries*. p. 94.
- St. Lifer, Evan. 1996. Net work: new roles, same mission. *Library Journal* 121 (19), 26-30.
- Schatzman, Leonard and Strauss, Anselm. (1973). *Field Research: Strategies for a Natural Sociology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Scheppke, Jim. (2002, January). PS. (From the state librarian) column. *Letter To Libraries Online*, 12 (1). <<http://www.osl.state.or.us/home/ltlo/ltlo.html>>.

Spradley, James P. (1979). *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stake, Robert E. (1994). Case studies. In Denizen, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 236-247). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

U.S. Department of Commerce. National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). (1995). *Falling through the net: A survey of "have nots" in rural and urban America*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce. <<http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/fallingthru.html>>

U.S. Department of Commerce. National Telecommunications and Information Administration. (1998). *Falling through the net II: New data on the digital divide*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce. National Telecommunications and Information Administration. <<http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/net2/>>

U.S. Department of Commerce. National Telecommunications and Information Administration. (1999). *Falling through the net: Defining the digital divide*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce. National Telecommunications and Information Administration. <<http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/ftn99/contents.html>>

U.S. Department of Commerce. National Telecommunications and Information Administration. (2000, October). *Falling through the net: Toward digital inclusion*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce. National Telecommunications and Information Administration. <<http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/ftn00/contents00.html>>

U.S. Department of Commerce. National Telecommunications and Information Administration and the Economics and Statistics Administration. (2002, February 5). *A nation online: How Americans are expanding their use of the Internet*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce. National Telecommunications and Information Administration. <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/dn/nationonline_020502.htm>

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *E-rate in relation to American Indian-Serving Schools*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute for the U.S. Department of Education. <http://www.ed.gov/Technology/erate_amer_indian.pdf>.

U.S. Department of Education. (2001a) *Empowerment zones and E-rate*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute for the U.S. Department of Education. <<http://www.ed.gov/Technology/ez.pdf>>.

U.S. Senate. (1996). *Telecommunications Act of 1996* (Public Law 104-104). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Section 254b. <<http://thomas.loc.gov/bss/d104/d104laws.html>>.

Universal Service Administrative Company. (2000). *Annual report*.
<<http://www.universalservice.org/reports/2000/>>.

University of Illinois. Graduate School of Library and Information Science. Library Research Center. (2000, June). *Survey of Internet Access Management in Public Libraries*.
<<http://www.lis.uiuc.edu/gslis/research/internet.pdf>>

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (2002). Frequently asked questions: Complying with the Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA) and the Neighborhood Children's Internet Protection Act (N-CIPA). <<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dlcl/pld/cipafaq.html>>

YAHOO. *Digital divide*.

<http://dir.yahoo.com/Social_Science/Science__Technology__and_Society_Studies/Digital_Divide/>.

Yin, Robert K. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX A: LSTA STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS & ASSURANCES

LSTA State Library Plan

The following is a summary of the state plan requirement for State library administrative agencies participating in the Grants to State Library Agencies program administered by IMLS.¹¹⁶ The State Plan shall:

1. Establish goals and specify priorities for the State consistent with the purposes of the LSTA, which states that a State library administrative agency shall expend at least 96% of the total amount of funds received under LSTA for:
 - Establishing or enhancing electronic linkages among or between libraries;
 - Linking libraries electronically with educational, social or information services;
 - Assisting libraries in accessing information through electronic networks;
 - Encouraging libraries in different areas, and encouraging different types of libraries to establish consortia and share resources; or
 - Paying costs for libraries to acquire or share computer systems and telecommunications technologies; and,
 - Targeting library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children (from birth through age 17) from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673 (2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved.
2. Describe activities that are consistent with these goals and priorities.
3. Describe the procedures to carry out the activities.
4. Describe the methodology that the State library administrative agency will use to evaluate the success of the activities in meeting the goals and priorities.
5. Describe the Plan for expenditure of 4% allowed for SLA administrative cost.
6. Describe the procedures that will be used to involve libraries and library users throughout the state in policy decisions regarding the implementation of the Plan.
7. Provide assurances satisfactory to the Director that the State agency will make reports, and provide information that the Director may reasonably require to determine the extent to which funds provided under the LSTA have been effective in carrying out the purpose of the LSTA.

LSTA requires that:

¹¹⁶ The plan requirements and (the below) assurances are based on the authors' correspondence with IMLS.

1. Each State library administrative agency shall independently evaluate, and report to the Director regarding the activities assisted under the LSTA prior to the end of the Five-year Plan.
2. Each library receiving assistance shall submit to the State library administrative agency such information as such State agency may require to meet the evaluation requirement.
3. Each State library administrative agency receiving a grant shall make the State Plan available to the public.

Required Assurances

The State library administrative agency shall provide the following assurances as part of the State Plan:

1. Assurances that the officially designated State library administrative agency has the fiscal and legal authority and capability to administer all aspects of the LSTA;
2. Assurances for establishing the State's policies, priorities, criteria, and procedures necessary to the implementation of all programs under LSTA;
3. Assurances that the State Plan will be submitted to the Director for approval;
4. Assurance that the State library agency spend no more than 4% on administrative cost; and,
5. Assurances that the State will comply with the Federal share and maintenance of effort levels described in Sec. 223 of the LSTA.

APPENDIX B: SLD ANALYSIS METHOD AND DESCRIPTION OF TABLES

Method in Brief

USAC supplied the data to the study team in a Microsoft Access database. Below is the complete description of each table provided by USAC. USAC provided the tables and based upon the study team's requests. Queries and reports were designed and written to generate tables B.1 – B.10 presented above.

The applicant table was linked to the funding request table using the form 471 application number as the common field. The field name is `FUND_REQ_ID` in the `t_APPLICANT_INFORMATION` table and `471_APPLICATION_NO` in the `t_FUNDING_REQUESTS` table. An additional table (`state_pop_2000`) was used to expand the state abbreviations to their full names and also supply the 2000 population values used to calculate the per capita rates. This basic structure was then used for each table with various parameters (`BUS_PARTY_CATG`, `FUND_REQ_YEAR`, `COMMITMENT_STATUS_CD`) used to control and filter the raw data to achieve the desired results.

The study team observed that when a funding request was denied, a null value was supplied for the `COMMITTED_AMT` variable. This value was changed to zero to facilitate mathematical calculations. Additionally, the `ORIGINAL_ANNUAL_COST` and `ORIGINAL_DISCOUNT` variables were found to be null in many cases. After consulting with several USAC employees, it was concluded that if an applicant had never modified a particular funding request amount, those two variables ended up in the supplied tables with null values. An update query was then written to create a new `ORIGINAL_ANNUAL_COST` variable and update those values to the correct amount. The new `ORIGINAL_ANNUAL_COST` variable was updated to equal the `COMMITTED_AMT` if the supplied `ORIGINAL_ANNUAL_COST` was supplied as null or left the same if it had a supplied value. This ensured that tables that dealt with requested funding by libraries would, in fact, generate the desired results.

The final modification to the supplied data involved the `SERVICE_ID` variable for the 1999 funding requests. It was observed that there were two different spellings for the service request that dealt with internal connections. The spellings `INTERNAL_CONNECTIONS` and `INTERNAL_CONNECTNS_S` were both combined to form one value, `INTERNAL_CONNECTIONS`.

Detailed Description of the Data Tables

The following represent the table definitions for the data that was used for this analysis. An additional table not shown here was generated from the 2000 US Census Bureau and shows the overall population for each state and territory reported in the tables B.1 – B.8.

E-Rate

Schools & Libraries Division

Prepared for the American Library Association

USAC

Universal

Service

Administrative

Comp

Table Name: t_APPLICANT_INFORMATION

Field:	Description	Value:
FUND_REQ_STATUS_PIA_CD	Application Review Code	PENDING, APPROVED, DENIED
FUND_REQ_CMMTMT_STATUS_CD	Application Status Code	INCOMPLETE, COMPLETE, PENDING
APPL_NM	Name of the requesting entity	
FUND_REQ_ID	FRN Cross-reference to 471 Application Number	
NCES_DISTRICT_NBR	Applicant's NCES City Code	
BUS_PARTY_CATG	Type of Applicant	SCHOOL, DISTRICT, LIBRARY, SLC CONSORTIUM
NCES_STATE_NBR	Applicant's NCES State Code	
NCES_BUILDING_NBR	Applicant's NCES Building Code	
SLC_BUS_PARTY_TYPE	Sub-type (eg. Main or branch library)	BUREAU INDIAN AFFAIRS, CATHOLIC DIOCESES, CATHOLIC SCHOOL, CONSORTIUM, LIBRARY BRANCH, MAIN PUBLIC LIBRARY, PRIVATE SCHOOL, PUBLIC DISTRICT, PUBLIC SCHOOL, STATE DOE, STATE
FUND_REQ_YEAR	Funding Year	1998, 1999, 2000
APPL_ZIP5_CD	Applicant's Zip Code	
LOCATED_IN_STATE_CD	Applicant's State	
APPL_CITY_NM	Applicant's City	
APPL_STREET_ADDR1	Applicant's Street Location	
BUS_PARTY_ID	Billed Entity Number, assigned by SLD	

E-Rate

Schools & Libraries Division

Prepared for the American Library Association

USAC

Universal

Service

Administrative

Compa

Table Name: t_FUNDED_ENTITIES

Field:	Description	Value:
BUS_PARTY_PRIM_CITY_NM	Funded Entity City	
FUNDED	Funding Category	Site Specific or Worksheet (Shared)
FUND_REQ_ID	FRN Cross-reference to 471 Application Number	
SHARED_WORKSHEET_CODE	Worksheet Code (Chart Number for shared services)	
BUS_PARTY_ID	Funded Entity Number	This is the number of the entity receiving funds, not necessarily the entity on the application.
LOCATED_IN_STATE_CD	Funded Entity State	
MAILING_ZIP5_CD	Funded Entity Zip	
BUS_PARTY_CATG	Funded Entity Type	
BUS_PARTY_ID_NEAREST_SCHL_DIST	Funded Library - Entity Number of the Nearest School District	
FUND_REQ_YEAR	Funding Year	
BUS_PARTY_PRIM_STREET_ADDR1	Funded Entity Street	
BUS_PARTY_NAME	Funded Entity Name	

E-Rate

Schools & Libraries Division

Prepared for the American Library Association

USAC

Universal

Service

Administrative

Comp

Table Name: t_FUNDING_REQUESTS

Field:	Description	Value:
SITE_SPECIFIC_ENTITY	Entity Number for Site Specific services	This field is blank for Shared
471_APPLICATION_NO	471 Application Number	
COMMITTED_AMOUNT	Amount process through Commitment	
ORIGINAL_DISCOUNT	Percent Discount	Approved amount after modification by PIA
ORIGINAL_ANNUAL_COST	Total Program Pre-Discount Amount (E * H)	Approved sum of Monthly / Annual Amount before modification by PIA
APPEALS_IND	Indicates if Applicant Filed an Appeal (Post Funding)	Y or N
SRVC_ORD_APPROVAL_STATUS_CD	Funding Request Status	APPROVED, DENIED, PENDING
APPROVED_DISCOUNT	Percent Discount	Approved amount after modification by PIA
COMMITMENT_STATUS_CD	Application Level Commitment Indicator	COMMITTED - FULL, DENIED, PENDING, UNFUNDED - NO PRIORITY
FUND_REQ_ID	Funding Request Number (FRN)	
SHARED_WORKSHEET_CODE	Worksheet Code (Chart Number for shared services)	This field is blank for Site Specific services.
APPROVED_ANNUAL_COST	Total Program Pre-Discount Amount (E * H)	Approved sum of Monthly / Annual Amount after modification by PIA
REQUESTED_AMT	Original Amount Requested (((Original Annual Cost * Original Discount Amount)/100)	
SERVICE_ID	Category of Service	TELCOMM SERVICES, INTERNET ACCESS, INTERNAL CONNECTIONS, INTERNAL CONNECTNS_S, DEDICATED SERVICES

The state and overall US populations figures were obtained from the US Census Bureau and reflect the population for the year 2000. The information was obtained at <<http://www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/respop.html>>.

Resident Population of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico: Census 2000

Area	Resident Population (April 1, 2000)
Alabama	4,447,100
Alaska	626,932
Arizona	5,130,632
Arkansas	2,673,400
California	33,871,648
Colorado	4,301,261
Connecticut	3,405,565
Delaware	783,600
District of Columbia	572,059
Florida	15,982,378
Georgia	8,186,453
Hawaii	1,211,537
Idaho	1,293,953
Illinois	12,419,293
Indiana	6,080,485
Iowa	2,926,324
Kansas	2,688,418
Kentucky	4,041,769
Louisiana	4,468,976
Maine	1,274,923
Maryland	5,296,486
Massachusetts	6,349,097
Michigan	9,938,444
Minnesota	4,919,479
Mississippi	2,844,658
Missouri	5,595,211
Montana	902,195
Nebraska	1,711,263
Nevada	1,998,257
New Hampshire	1,235,786
New Jersey	8,414,350
New Mexico	1,819,046
New York	18,976,457
North Carolina	8,049,313
North Dakota	642,200
Ohio	11,353,140
Oklahoma	3,450,654
Oregon	3,421,399
Pennsylvania	12,281,054
Rhode Island	1,048,319
South Carolina	4,012,012

South Dakota	754,844
Tennessee	5,689,283
Texas	20,851,820
Utah	2,233,169
Vermont	608,827
Virginia	7,078,515
Washington	5,894,121
West Virginia	1,808,344
Wisconsin	5,363,675
Wyoming	493,782
Total Resident Population¹	281,421,906
Puerto Rico	3,808,610
Total Resident Population, including Puerto Rico	285,230,516

¹ Includes the population of the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

NOTE: Consistent with the January 1999 U.S. Supreme Court ruling (*Department of Commerce v. House of Representatives*, 525 U.S. 316, 119 S. Ct. 765 (1999)), the resident population counts used in the apportionment population counts do not reflect the use of statistical sampling to correct for overcounting or undercounting.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau.

Internet Release date: December 28, 2000

Table B.1 Year 2 E-rate Funds Committed to Libraries.

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Requests</i>	<i>Committed Amount</i>	<i>2000 Population</i>	<i>Per Capita</i>
Alabama	317	\$611,550.19	4,447,100	\$0.138
Alaska	90	\$130,629.52	626,932	\$0.208
Arizona	244	\$423,394.05	5,130,632	\$0.083
Arkansas	127	\$92,031.08	2,673,400	\$0.034
California	282	\$3,232,930.38	33,871,648	\$0.095
Colorado	251	\$679,988.02	4,301,261	\$0.158
Connecticut	130	\$477,060.81	3,405,565	\$0.140
Delaware	36	\$88,832.66	783,600	\$0.113
District of Columbia	3	\$362,268.90	572,059	\$0.633
Florida	408	\$3,465,892.71	15,982,378	\$0.217
Georgia	256	\$6,732,990.62	8,186,453	\$0.822
Hawaii	97	\$96,944.73	1,211,537	\$0.080
Idaho	118	\$124,331.42	1,293,953	\$0.096
Illinois	823	\$2,122,060.75	12,419,293	\$0.171
Indiana	395	\$855,414.21	6,080,485	\$0.141
Iowa	488	\$400,876.10	2,926,324	\$0.137
Kansas	323	\$304,580.55	2,688,418	\$0.113
Kentucky	345	\$726,323.78	4,041,769	\$0.180
Louisiana	226	\$1,492,264.16	4,468,976	\$0.334
Maine	96	\$131,696.39	1,274,923	\$0.103
Maryland	138	\$2,312,295.70	5,296,486	\$0.437
Massachusetts	218	\$2,705,206.97	6,349,097	\$0.426
Michigan	543	\$1,802,025.30	9,938,444	\$0.181
Minnesota	116	\$536,505.71	4,919,479	\$0.109
Mississippi	381	\$1,116,400.54	2,844,658	\$0.392
Missouri	134	\$590,198.16	5,595,211	\$0.105
Montana	202	\$128,565.59	902,195	\$0.143
Nebraska	239	\$186,298.29	1,711,263	\$0.109
Nevada	58	\$103,681.67	1,998,257	\$0.052
New Hampshire	104	\$67,432.93	1,235,786	\$0.055

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Requests</i>	<i>Committed Amount</i>	<i>2000 Population</i>	<i>Per Capita</i>
New Jersey	271	\$1,436,719.48	8,414,350	\$0.171
New Mexico	46	\$43,909.65	1,819,046	\$0.024
New York	1491	\$12,164,440.43	18,976,457	\$0.641
North Carolina	268	\$1,662,311.69	8,049,313	\$0.207
North Dakota	32	\$23,862.58	642,200	\$0.037
Northern Mariana Islands	2	\$14,308.14	71,912	\$0.199
Ohio	286	\$3,200,228.30	11,353,140	\$0.282
Oklahoma	381	\$578,663.89	3,450,654	\$0.168
Oregon	210	\$563,452.89	3,421,399	\$0.165
Pennsylvania	815	\$2,088,736.90	12,281,054	\$0.170
Puerto Rico	152	\$3,206,056.50	3,808,610	\$0.842
Rhode Island	54	\$135,708.38	1,048,319	\$0.129
South Carolina	34	\$129,646.44	4,012,012	\$0.032
South Dakota	48	\$21,997.35	754,844	\$0.029
Tennessee	441	\$908,681.61	5,689,283	\$0.160
Texas	464	\$1,890,740.69	20,851,820	\$0.091
Utah	46	\$155,139.02	2,233,169	\$0.069
Vermont	91	\$82,797.80	608,827	\$0.136
Virgin Islands	3	\$0.00	108,612	\$0.000
Virginia	271	\$1,594,545.92	7,078,515	\$0.225
Washington	254	\$1,432,691.70	5,894,121	\$0.243
West Virginia	209	\$493,000.60	1,808,344	\$0.273
Wisconsin	315	\$927,153.58	5,363,675	\$0.173
Wyoming	100	\$140,258.08	493,782	\$0.284
Grand Total		\$64,995,723.51		

Table B.2 Year 3 E-rate Funds Committed to Libraries.

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Requests</i>	<i>Committed Amount</i>	<i>2000 Population</i>	<i>Per Capita</i>
Alaska	87	\$109,029.75	626,932	\$0.174
Alabama	242	\$640,764.61	4,447,100	\$0.144
Arkansas	118	\$59,884.40	2,673,400	\$0.022
Arizona	254	\$405,758.16	5,130,632	\$0.079
California	439	\$3,028,545.57	33,871,648	\$0.089
Colorado	303	\$785,067.90	4,301,261	\$0.183
Connecticut	101	\$305,189.56	3,405,565	\$0.090
District of Columbia	5	\$57,189.60	572,059	\$0.100
Delaware	28	\$54,303.28	783,600	\$0.069
Florida	444	\$2,997,379.03	15,982,378	\$0.188
Georgia	156	\$5,298,414.90	8,186,453	\$0.647
Guam	9	\$62,241.66	154,805	\$0.402
Hawaii	99	\$115,715.87	1,211,537	\$0.096
Iowa	579	\$261,981.09	2,926,324	\$0.090
Idaho	81	\$88,459.55	1,293,953	\$0.068
Illinois	879	\$1,863,074.68	12,419,293	\$0.150
Indiana	459	\$811,270.98	6,080,485	\$0.133
Kansas	323	\$352,706.41	2,688,418	\$0.131
Kentucky	349	\$858,435.33	4,041,769	\$0.212
Louisiana	185	\$1,297,106.18	4,468,976	\$0.290
Massachusetts	112	\$2,760,896.99	6,349,097	\$0.435
Maryland	130	\$1,021,204.57	5,296,486	\$0.193
Maine	72	\$84,980.62	1,274,923	\$0.067
Michigan	536	\$1,549,710.25	9,938,444	\$0.156
Minnesota	149	\$205,165.98	4,919,479	\$0.042
Missouri	125	\$577,725.27	5,595,211	\$0.103
Mississippi	346	\$966,248.81	2,844,658	\$0.340
Montana	218	\$134,300.94	902,195	\$0.149
North Carolina	293	\$1,774,582.22	8,049,313	\$0.220
North Dakota	24	\$14,516.53	642,200	\$0.023

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Requests</i>	<i>Committed Amount</i>	<i>2000 Population</i>	<i>Per Capita</i>
Nebraska	274	\$202,769.95	1,711,263	\$0.118
New Hampshire	75	\$60,138.56	1,235,786	\$0.049
New Jersey	279	\$1,044,125.62	8,414,350	\$0.124
New Mexico	69	\$418,891.02	1,819,046	\$0.230
Nevada	65	\$64,141.09	1,998,257	\$0.032
New York	1382	\$15,439,444.32	18,976,457	\$0.814
Ohio	180	\$1,480,452.98	11,353,140	\$0.130
Oklahoma	462	\$761,320.97	3,450,654	\$0.221
Oregon	247	\$479,788.57	3,421,399	\$0.140
Pennsylvania	725	\$1,552,281.43	12,281,054	\$0.126
Puerto Rico	249	\$4,459,052.40	3,808,610	\$1.171
Rhode Island	36	\$71,394.21	1,048,319	\$0.068
South Carolina	66	\$113,027.64	4,012,012	\$0.028
South Dakota	33	\$10,568.33	754,844	\$0.014
Tennessee	529	\$1,217,486.73	5,689,283	\$0.214
Texas	706	\$5,633,263.09	20,851,820	\$0.270
Utah	57	\$173,480.69	2,233,169	\$0.078
Virginia	270	\$1,237,923.17	7,078,515	\$0.175
Virgin Islands	4	\$79,099.54	108,612	\$0.728
Vermont	115	\$80,554.13	608,827	\$0.132
Washington	499	\$1,361,799.96	5,894,121	\$0.231
Wisconsin	285	\$1,381,418.60	5,363,675	\$0.258
West Virginia	259	\$167,617.41	1,808,344	\$0.093
Wyoming	86	\$58,433.54	493,782	\$0.118
Grand Total		\$66,090,324.64		

Table B.3 Year 2 E-rate Funding Received and Requested.

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Requests</i>	<i>Committed Amount</i>	<i>Requested Amount</i>	<i>Difference</i>
Alabama	317	\$611,550.19	\$750,669.88	(\$139,119.69)
Alaska	90	\$130,629.52	\$146,444.52	(\$15,815.00)
Arizona	244	\$423,394.05	\$619,620.93	(\$196,226.88)
Arkansas	127	\$92,031.08	\$132,176.27	(\$40,145.19)
California	282	\$3,232,930.38	\$3,886,457.90	(\$653,527.52)
Colorado	251	\$679,988.02	\$841,306.15	(\$161,318.13)
Connecticut	130	\$477,060.81	\$564,766.56	(\$87,705.75)
Delaware	36	\$88,832.66	\$130,509.08	(\$41,676.42)
District of Columbia	3	\$362,268.90	\$452,941.83	(\$90,672.93)
Florida	408	\$3,465,892.71	\$4,155,091.08	(\$689,198.37)
Georgia	256	\$6,732,990.62	\$7,045,197.21	(\$312,206.59)
Hawaii	97	\$96,944.73	\$846,815.83	(\$749,871.10)
Idaho	118	\$124,331.42	\$136,366.71	(\$12,035.29)
Illinois	823	\$2,122,060.75	\$3,439,550.82	(\$1,317,490.07)
Indiana	395	\$855,414.21	\$1,537,162.05	(\$681,747.84)
Iowa	488	\$400,876.10	\$766,139.35	(\$365,263.25)
Kansas	323	\$304,580.55	\$508,680.45	(\$204,099.90)
Kentucky	345	\$726,323.78	\$850,826.51	(\$124,502.73)
Louisiana	226	\$1,492,264.16	\$1,687,717.86	(\$195,453.70)
Maine	96	\$131,696.39	\$144,300.69	(\$12,604.30)
Maryland	138	\$2,312,295.70	\$3,031,242.02	(\$718,946.32)
Massachusetts	218	\$2,705,206.97	\$3,461,353.12	(\$756,146.15)
Michigan	543	\$1,802,025.30	\$3,613,297.58	(\$1,811,272.28)
Minnesota	116	\$536,505.71	\$632,451.37	(\$95,945.66)
Mississippi	381	\$1,116,400.54	\$1,121,582.25	(\$5,181.71)
Missouri	134	\$590,198.16	\$646,168.44	(\$55,970.28)
Montana	202	\$128,565.59	\$134,814.84	(\$6,249.25)
Nebraska	239	\$186,298.29	\$215,806.03	(\$29,507.74)
Nevada	58	\$103,681.67	\$185,012.86	(\$81,331.19)

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Requests</i>	<i>Committed Amount</i>	<i>Requested Amount</i>	<i>Difference</i>
New Hampshire	104	\$67,432.93	\$81,211.93	(\$13,779.00)
New Jersey	271	\$1,436,719.48	\$1,673,465.13	(\$236,745.65)
New Mexico	46	\$43,909.65	\$103,940.48	(\$60,030.83)
New York	1491	\$12,164,440.43	\$14,590,327.09	(\$2,425,886.66)
North Carolina	268	\$1,662,311.69	\$1,916,190.40	(\$253,878.71)
North Dakota	32	\$23,862.58	\$27,082.02	(\$3,219.44)
Northern Mariana Islands	2	\$14,308.14	\$15,800.31	(\$1,492.17)
Ohio	286	\$3,200,228.30	\$4,822,641.59	(\$1,622,413.29)
Oklahoma	381	\$578,663.89	\$800,327.95	(\$221,664.06)
Oregon	210	\$563,452.89	\$621,278.06	(\$57,825.17)
Pennsylvania	815	\$2,088,736.90	\$3,040,810.08	(\$952,073.18)
Puerto Rico	152	\$3,206,056.50	\$3,264,988.95	(\$58,932.45)
Rhode Island	54	\$135,708.38	\$144,196.92	(\$8,488.54)
South Carolina	34	\$129,646.44	\$82,647.75	\$46,998.69
South Dakota	48	\$21,997.35	\$36,749.19	(\$14,751.84)
Tennessee	441	\$908,681.61	\$1,018,629.31	(\$109,947.70)
Texas	464	\$1,890,740.69	\$2,203,652.77	(\$312,912.08)
Utah	46	\$155,139.02	\$168,786.82	(\$13,647.80)
Vermont	91	\$82,797.80	\$112,519.62	(\$29,721.82)
Virgin Islands	3	\$0.00	\$1,388.70	(\$1,388.70)
Virginia	271	\$1,594,545.92	\$1,774,250.10	(\$179,704.18)
Washington	254	\$1,432,691.70	\$1,644,500.92	(\$211,809.22)
West Virginia	209	\$493,000.60	\$543,948.38	(\$50,947.78)
Wisconsin	315	\$927,153.58	\$1,119,796.63	(\$192,643.05)
Wyoming	100	\$140,258.08	\$145,139.57	(\$4,881.49)
Grand Totals	13472	\$64,995,723.51	\$81,638,740.88	(\$16,643,017.37)

Table B.4 Year 3 E-rate Funding Received and Requested.

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Requests</i>	<i>Committed Amount</i>	<i>Requested Amount</i>	<i>Difference</i>
Alabama	242	\$640,764.61	\$755,371.08	(\$114,606.47)
Alaska	87	\$109,029.75	\$123,583.80	(\$14,554.05)
Arizona	254	\$405,758.16	\$675,505.71	(\$269,747.55)
Arkansas	118	\$59,884.40	\$98,019.21	(\$38,134.81)
California	439	\$3,028,545.57	\$5,872,743.75	(\$2,844,198.18)
Colorado	303	\$785,067.90	\$941,578.76	(\$156,510.86)
Connecticut	101	\$305,189.56	\$433,079.26	(\$127,889.70)
Delaware	28	\$54,303.28	\$56,196.89	(\$1,893.61)
District of Columbia	5	\$57,189.60	\$297,841.50	(\$240,651.90)
Florida	444	\$2,997,379.03	\$5,456,486.79	(\$2,459,107.76)
Georgia	156	\$5,298,414.90	\$6,561,662.67	(\$1,263,247.77)
Guam	9	\$62,241.66	\$362,579.26	(\$300,337.60)
Hawaii	99	\$115,715.87	\$146,533.08	(\$30,817.21)
Idaho	81	\$88,459.55	\$110,563.91	(\$22,104.36)
Illinois	879	\$1,863,074.68	\$3,114,498.45	(\$1,251,423.77)
Indiana	459	\$811,270.98	\$1,130,850.00	(\$319,579.02)
Iowa	579	\$261,981.09	\$414,344.79	(\$152,363.70)
Kansas	323	\$352,706.41	\$3,122,852.14	(\$2,770,145.73)
Kentucky	349	\$858,435.33	\$1,638,361.68	(\$779,926.35)
Louisiana	185	\$1,297,106.18	\$1,850,243.58	(\$553,137.40)
Maine	72	\$84,980.62	\$124,454.65	(\$39,474.03)
Maryland	130	\$1,021,204.57	\$1,723,368.47	(\$702,163.90)
Massachusetts	112	\$2,760,896.99	\$3,359,784.73	(\$598,887.74)
Michigan	536	\$1,549,710.25	\$2,037,848.16	(\$488,137.91)
Minnesota	149	\$205,165.98	\$516,642.72	(\$311,476.74)
Mississippi	346	\$966,248.81	\$1,250,505.84	(\$284,257.03)
Missouri	125	\$577,725.27	\$628,721.30	(\$50,996.03)
Montana	218	\$134,300.94	\$193,038.29	(\$58,737.35)
Nebraska	274	\$202,769.95	\$233,261.94	(\$30,491.99)

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Requests</i>	<i>Committed Amount</i>	<i>Requested Amount</i>	<i>Difference</i>
Nevada	65	\$64,141.09	\$109,019.09	(\$44,878.00)
New Hampshire	75	\$60,138.56	\$71,685.65	(\$11,547.09)
New Jersey	279	\$1,044,125.62	\$1,564,855.23	(\$520,729.61)
New Mexico	69	\$418,891.02	\$475,725.53	(\$56,834.51)
New York	1382	\$15,439,444.32	\$29,209,312.30	(\$13,769,867.98)
North Carolina	293	\$1,774,582.22	\$2,047,206.88	(\$272,624.66)
North Dakota	24	\$14,516.53	\$39,688.74	(\$25,172.21)
Ohio	180	\$1,480,452.98	\$5,487,723.30	(\$4,007,270.32)
Oklahoma	462	\$761,320.97	\$909,938.92	(\$148,617.95)
Oregon	247	\$479,788.57	\$1,135,823.31	(\$656,034.74)
Pennsylvania	725	\$1,552,281.43	\$3,171,383.48	(\$1,619,102.05)
Puerto Rico	249	\$4,459,052.40	\$5,036,502.44	(\$577,450.04)
Rhode Island	36	\$71,394.21	\$115,982.68	(\$44,588.47)
South Carolina	66	\$113,027.64	\$141,617.74	(\$28,590.10)
South Dakota	33	\$10,568.33	\$26,054.40	(\$15,486.07)
Tennessee	529	\$1,217,486.73	\$1,938,264.86	(\$720,778.13)
Texas	706	\$5,633,263.09	\$7,157,828.99	(\$1,524,565.90)
Utah	57	\$173,480.69	\$212,536.18	(\$39,055.49)
Vermont	115	\$80,554.13	\$118,468.57	(\$37,914.44)
Virgin Islands	4	\$79,099.54	\$102,119.45	(\$23,019.91)
Virginia	270	\$1,237,923.17	\$1,521,649.18	(\$283,726.01)
Washington	499	\$1,361,799.96	\$3,087,041.00	(\$1,725,241.04)
West Virginia	259	\$167,617.41	\$188,413.60	(\$20,796.19)
Wisconsin	285	\$1,381,418.60	\$1,694,524.47	(\$313,105.87)
Wyoming	86	\$58,433.54	\$61,269.23	(\$2,835.69)
Grand Totals	14097	\$66,090,324.64	\$108,855,157.62	(\$42,764,832.98)

Table B.5 Year 2 E-rate Denied Requests.

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Denials</i>	<i>Denied Amount</i>	<i>2000 Population</i>	<i>Per Capita</i>
Alabama	47	\$106,909.08	4,447,100	\$0.024
Alaska	7	\$8,269.52	626,932	\$0.013
Arizona	31	\$93,336.40	5,130,632	\$0.018
Arkansas	15	\$34,822.59	2,673,400	\$0.013
California	41	\$406,833.30	33,871,648	\$0.012
Colorado	15	\$137,152.03	4,301,261	\$0.032
Connecticut	21	\$53,402.46	3,405,565	\$0.016
District of Columbia	1	\$90,672.92	572,059	\$0.159
Florida	35	\$485,239.08	15,982,378	\$0.030
Georgia	14	\$97,654.77	8,186,453	\$0.012
Idaho	19	\$8,479.76	1,293,953	\$0.007
Illinois	122	\$1,268,602.03	12,419,293	\$0.102
Indiana	50	\$134,173.73	6,080,485	\$0.022
Iowa	90	\$334,377.07	2,926,324	\$0.114
Kansas	49	\$187,756.90	2,688,418	\$0.070
Kentucky	29	\$51,020.52	4,041,769	\$0.013
Louisiana	25	\$145,898.99	4,468,976	\$0.033
Maine	13	\$10,057.00	1,274,923	\$0.008
Maryland	8	\$595,871.28	5,296,486	\$0.113
Massachusetts	26	\$723,369.14	6,349,097	\$0.114
Michigan	72	\$1,737,089.93	9,938,444	\$0.175
Minnesota	6	\$10,926.99	4,919,479	\$0.002
Mississippi	3	\$3,731.88	2,844,658	\$0.001
Missouri	20	\$43,916.62	5,595,211	\$0.008
Montana	7	\$8,854.05	902,195	\$0.010
Nebraska	43	\$21,666.94	1,711,263	\$0.013
Nevada	2	\$81,144.36	1,998,257	\$0.041

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Denials</i>	<i>Denied Amount</i>	<i>2000 Population</i>	<i>Per Capita</i>
New Hampshire	8	\$10,254.81	1,235,786	\$0.008
New Jersey	49	\$173,851.34	8,414,350	\$0.021
New Mexico	11	\$58,171.80	1,819,046	\$0.032
New York	338	\$1,569,517.58	18,976,457	\$0.083
North Carolina	19	\$133,067.66	8,049,313	\$0.017
Ohio	59	\$1,420,785.08	11,353,140	\$0.125
Oklahoma	19	\$162,134.23	3,450,654	\$0.047
Oregon	29	\$42,775.91	3,421,399	\$0.013
Pennsylvania	76	\$760,774.45	12,281,054	\$0.062
Puerto Rico	38	\$2,223.00	3,808,610	\$0.001
South Carolina	8	\$17,615.40	4,012,012	\$0.004
South Dakota	9	\$14,120.18	754,844	\$0.019
Tennessee	49	\$50,547.54	5,689,283	\$0.009
Texas	64	\$96,800.76	20,851,820	\$0.005
Utah	6	\$9,873.52	2,233,169	\$0.004
Vermont	11	\$30,593.14	608,827	\$0.050
Virgin Islands	3	\$1,388.70	108,612	\$0.013
Virginia	25	\$100,037.38	7,078,515	\$0.014
Washington	20	\$167,899.06	5,894,121	\$0.028
West Virginia	1	\$1,440.00	1,808,344	\$0.001
Wisconsin	39	\$51,189.54	5,363,675	\$0.010
Grand Totals	1692	\$11,756,290.43		

Table B.6 Year 3 E-rate Denied Requests.

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Denials</i>	<i>Denied Amount</i>	<i>2000 Population</i>	<i>Per Capita</i>
Alabama	18	\$71,656.44	4,447,100	\$0.016
Alaska	1	\$4,701.12	626,932	\$0.007
Arizona	63	\$157,649.85	5,130,632	\$0.031
California	58	\$2,186,476.97	33,871,648	\$0.065
Colorado	36	\$127,038.36	4,301,261	\$0.030
Connecticut	11	\$93,576.52	3,405,565	\$0.027
District of Columbia	2	\$82,626.55	572,059	\$0.144
Florida	132	\$2,375,795.32	15,982,378	\$0.149
Georgia	33	\$1,099,515.32	8,186,453	\$0.134
Guam	5	\$300,337.60	154,805	\$1.940
Idaho	10	\$10,623.98	1,293,953	\$0.008
Illinois	86	\$704,476.42	12,419,293	\$0.057
Indiana	91	\$259,738.35	6,080,485	\$0.043
Iowa	66	\$137,800.61	2,926,324	\$0.047
Kansas	59	\$2,758,376.70	2,688,418	\$1.026
Kentucky	55	\$677,466.16	4,041,769	\$0.168
Louisiana	58	\$500,702.61	4,468,976	\$0.112
Maine	17	\$36,321.63	1,274,923	\$0.028
Maryland	15	\$655,725.36	5,296,486	\$0.124
Massachusetts	28	\$514,818.55	6,349,097	\$0.081
Michigan	78	\$415,946.08	9,938,444	\$0.042
Minnesota	34	\$299,965.12	4,919,479	\$0.061
Mississippi	17	\$260,137.38	2,844,658	\$0.091
Missouri	9	\$29,018.21	5,595,211	\$0.005
Montana	23	\$43,954.28	902,195	\$0.049
Nebraska	37	\$24,961.46	1,711,263	\$0.015
Nevada	21	\$42,333.77	1,998,257	\$0.021

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Denials</i>	<i>Denied Amount</i>	<i>2000 Population</i>	<i>Per Capita</i>
New Hampshire	7	\$5,560.97	1,235,786	\$0.004
New Jersey	42	\$309,336.39	8,414,350	\$0.037
New Mexico	4	\$21,500.54	1,819,046	\$0.012
New York	205	\$5,755,333.71	18,976,457	\$0.303
North Carolina	15	\$167,812.19	8,049,313	\$0.021
North Dakota	2	\$23,261.85	642,200	\$0.036
Ohio	16	\$3,847,753.35	11,353,140	\$0.339
Oklahoma	44	\$131,895.79	3,450,654	\$0.038
Oregon	49	\$647,548.68	3,421,399	\$0.189
Pennsylvania	80	\$1,447,900.08	12,281,054	\$0.118
Puerto Rico	9	\$138,533.30	3,808,610	\$0.036
Rhode Island	7	\$37,601.88	1,048,319	\$0.036
South Carolina	6	\$27,441.92	4,012,012	\$0.007
South Dakota	4	\$13,948.04	754,844	\$0.018
Tennessee	61	\$465,183.02	5,689,283	\$0.082
Texas	84	\$988,052.18	20,851,820	\$0.047
Utah	6	\$26,010.18	2,233,169	\$0.012
Vermont	22	\$27,210.48	608,827	\$0.045
Virgin Islands	1	\$7,200.00	108,612	\$0.066
Virginia	49	\$269,172.58	7,078,515	\$0.038
Washington	135	\$1,545,240.64	5,894,121	\$0.262
West Virginia	5	\$16,627.27	1,808,344	\$0.009
Wisconsin	52	\$148,460.63	5,363,675	\$0.028
Wyoming	4	\$2,144.78	493,782	\$0.004
Grand Totals	1972	\$29,942,471.16		

Table B.7 Year 2 E-rate Types of Services Requested

<i>State</i>	<i>Type of Service Requested</i>	<i>Number of Request</i>	<i>Committed Amount</i>
<i>Alabama</i>	DEDICATED SERVICES	21	\$31,817.08
	INTERNAL CONNECTIONS	37	\$68,052.79
	INTERNET ACCESS	74	\$155,531.40
	TELCOMM SERVICES	138	\$356,148.92
	<i>State Total</i>	270	\$611,550.19
<i>Alaska</i>	DEDICATED SERVICES	3	\$2,770.80
	INTERNAL CONNECTIONS	4	\$11,278.30
	INTERNET ACCESS	25	\$41,052.41
	TELCOMM SERVICES	51	\$75,528.01
	<i>State Total</i>	83	\$130,629.52
<i>Arizona</i>	DEDICATED SERVICES	34	\$50,904.46
	INTERNAL CONNECTIONS	47	\$52,235.79
	INTERNET ACCESS	14	\$46,172.29
	TELCOMM SERVICES	118	\$274,081.51
	<i>State Total</i>	213	\$423,394.05
<i>Arkansas</i>	DEDICATED SERVICES	28	\$17,434.36
	INTERNAL CONNECTIONS	2	\$5,472.00
	INTERNET ACCESS	6	\$5,677.20
	TELCOMM SERVICES	76	\$63,447.52
	<i>State Total</i>	112	\$92,031.08
<i>California</i>	DEDICATED SERVICES	35	\$108,178.91
	INTERNAL CONNECTIONS	51	\$824,568.41
	INTERNET ACCESS	32	\$335,795.34
	TELCOMM SERVICES	123	\$1,964,387.72
	<i>State Total</i>	241	\$3,232,930.38
<i>Colorado</i>	DEDICATED SERVICES	10	\$11,842.75
	INTERNAL CONNECTIONS	7	\$30,379.86
	INTERNET ACCESS	40	\$81,449.02
	TELCOMM SERVICES	179	\$556,316.39
	<i>State Total</i>	236	\$679,988.02

<i>State</i>	<i>Type of Service Requested</i>	<i>Number of Request</i>	<i>Committed Amount</i>
<i>Connecticut</i>			
	DEDICATED SERVICES	52	\$71,459.16
	INTERNAL CONNECTIONS	4	\$142,460.48
	INTERNET ACCESS	14	\$66,633.36
	TELCOMM SERVICES	39	\$196,507.81
	<i>State Total</i>	109	\$477,060.81
<i>Delaware</i>			
	DEDICATED SERVICES	1	\$553.06
	TELCOMM SERVICES	35	\$88,279.60
	<i>State Total</i>	36	\$88,832.66
<i>District of Columbia</i>			
	INTERNET ACCESS	1	\$53,448.66
	TELCOMM SERVICES	1	\$308,820.24
	<i>State Total</i>	2	\$362,268.90
<i>Florida</i>			
	DEDICATED SERVICES	63	\$164,080.83
	INTERNAL CONNECTIONS	55	\$885,421.76
	INTERNET ACCESS	37	\$307,810.92
	TELCOMM SERVICES	218	\$2,108,579.20
	<i>State Total</i>	373	\$3,465,892.71
<i>Georgia</i>			
	DEDICATED SERVICES	42	\$72,879.40
	INTERNAL CONNECTIONS	37	\$399,199.46
	INTERNET ACCESS	27	\$1,345,707.78
	TELCOMM SERVICES	136	\$4,915,203.98
	<i>State Total</i>	242	\$6,732,990.62
<i>Hawaii</i>			
	DEDICATED SERVICES	73	\$85,192.29
	TELCOMM SERVICES	24	\$11,752.44
	<i>State Total</i>	97	\$96,944.73
<i>Idaho</i>			
	DEDICATED SERVICES	20	\$16,277.71
	INTERNAL CONNECTIONS	3	\$14,998.00
	INTERNET ACCESS	20	\$19,694.61
	TELCOMM SERVICES	56	\$73,361.10
	<i>State Total</i>	99	\$124,331.42